

I read a commentator who quoted Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz, in what the commentator thought was a damning admission on this story, when he said:

Yes, we had other reasons for going into Iraq, but we stressed weapons of mass destruction because that was the one everybody was focused on.

According to the commentator, that is a damning admission on the part of the Secretary that we had other motives, and that is part of the attack that is being mounted on the floor, that the Bush administration was duplicitous: They told us they were going after weapons of mass destruction, but they had other motives. And here, Secretary Wolfowitz has admitted it; a smoking gun.

Back to my memory. I remember very clearly that the Bush administration openly and directly said they had other motives. Let me go down them as I remember them.

Weapons of mass destruction—there are many countries that have weapons of mass destruction. If we were to go after the country in the world, other than ourselves, that has the highest stock of weapons of mass destruction, we would go after Russia. Why don't we? Because weapons of mass destruction alone are by no means justification for attacking another nation. They must be tied to other motives. This is what I am sure Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz was talking about.

Right now President Putin and President Bush have a good relationship. Russia and the United States have a trusting relationship. Why should we attack Russia just because it has weapons of mass destruction when that relationship exists?

Iraq was ruled by a tyrant, and not just your everyday tyrant but a brutal, bloody tyrant who had demonstrated that he not only possessed weapons of mass destruction, he was willing to use weapons of mass destruction and has done so—the only person in the world whose government has employed weapons of mass destruction against anyone else—in this case it was his own people—in the last half century. So, yes, there are other motives besides possessing weapons of mass destruction. They are the man's personality and his history.

We are not just interested in nations that have WMD. We are interested in brutal tyrants who will use weapons of mass destruction.

Next, Iraq was clearly a crossroads of terrorist activity. That is what Senator GRAHAM referred to, not just al-Qaida. Iraq was one of the principal financial supporters of the terrorist suicide bombings in Palestine. They offered a \$100,000 reward to anyone who would kill himself as long as he took a few Jews with him. How many tyrants around the world are willing to harbor terrorists and support terrorists? The list gets a little smaller.

North Korea has weapons of mass destruction. North Korea is ruled by a

brutal tyrant. But North Korea has not invaded any of its neighbors for half a century, and North Korea is not a haven for al-Qaida, Hamas, Hezbollah, and the other terrorist organizations. We are closing down here on the other motives.

Attacking your neighbors. Saddam Hussein has attacked his neighbors twice in the last dozen years, set off two major wars, and is responsible for killing more Muslims than any other person on the planet.

The other motives that the Bush administration had in dealing with Iraq were the totality of the situation. Yes, they wanted to deal with WMD. Yes, they wanted to deal with a tyrant who was brutalizing his own people. Yes, they wanted to deal with terrorism. And, yes, they wanted to deal with somebody who was threatening his neighbors. If you take that criteria and apply it to all the countries in the world, you come up with only one that qualifies on every count.

It was not the single issue that current commentators and candidates, pundits and pollsters are talking about that prompted President Bush to give the order to go ahead in Iraq. It is a distortion of history to hammer again and again on the fraud that says only weapons of mass destruction drove us to go into Iraq, and it is our failure to find weapons of mass destruction in this time period in Iraq that demonstrates we were wrong.

Nobody has gone to the last part of that sentence. Nobody has said yet that we were wrong to have taken out Saddam Hussein. They come close to that in their attack on the President. They say he lied. They say he manipulated. They say he distorted. But they cannot quite bring themselves to say we were wrong to have done it, and no one will say the world would have been a better place if we had not. Why? Because we have discovered some other things we did not know.

If you are going to talk about intelligence failures, our intelligence community did not know until we got into Iraq about the mass graves. We did not know about the prisons holding children who were put in there as young as 4 and 5 years of age and have been there for 5 years or more.

We did not know the details of the brutality of this man. We did not know that he treated his own population, those who were hostile to him or, indeed, simply suspect in his eyes, as brutally as Adolf Hitler treated the Jews in World War II in Germany. We did not know that. We have discovered that now. So no one will quite go to the point of saying we made a mistake, that Bush did the wrong thing.

One commentator closed his attack on the Bush administration with this interesting quibble, in my view. He said: It was the right war but it was fought for the wrong reason. I find it very difficult to reconcile those two. If it was the right war and has achieved the right result, it was the right thing

to have done, and it was the right thing to have done for all of the reasons that people who hate this administration are now conveniently forgetting all of the historical buildup to this that has gone down the memory hole that people are now conveniently saying never happened.

This is a historic Chamber, and it has seen all kinds of debates, high and low. It has seen all standards of rhetoric, good and bad, and, yes, if I may, true and false. There has been a call for the rafters here to be ringing in a discussion of the Iraqi war and America's activity. I wanted to answer that call and do what I can to see that the rafters are ringing with the truth; that the rafters are ringing with real history, not invented history; that the rafters are ringing with a recognition that what the Bush administration has done in Iraq was the right thing to have done; it was based on sound and careful analysis that ran over two administrations; that was vetted thoroughly with our allies abroad, bringing Great Britain, Australia, Poland, and others, into the fight, and the result has demonstrated that the world is a safer place.

The Iraqi people live in a safer society, and the prospects for the future are better than would have been the case if we had gone to the brink, as President Clinton did, and then changed our minds. President Clinton thought the evidence was overwhelming but decided not to act. President Bush thought the evidence was overwhelming and did act, and the rafters should ring with at least one speech that applauds that decision and that level of leadership.

I say to my colleagues, I say to the country, I say to my constituents, I believe the history is there that justifies the decision, and I believe the evidence is there after the fact that more than justifies the decision.

In this case, America and her President can stand proud before the world as having done the right thing for the right reason.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BENNETT. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period for morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRATULATING ROBERT AND ERMA BYRD ON THEIR 66TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, last Thursday marked an important—and

extraordinary—milestone in the lives of two very special members of our Senate family.

On May 29, 1937—66 years and one week ago today—ROBERT CARLYLE BYRD and Erma Ora James were married.

The Senate was not in session on their actual anniversary, so I come to the floor today—one week later—to congratulate Senator and Mrs. Byrd on their remarkable achievement.

ROBERT and Erma Byrd both grew up in the hardscrabble coal country of West Virginia. They were high school sweethearts.

Of all of Senator BYRD's tremendous achievements—and there are many—I suspect the two that mean the most to him are convincing Erma James to marry him in the first place—and staying married to her all these years.

I have heard Senator BYRD say often that he could not do this job were it not for his wife's love and support. In his words: "She is not only my wife, but also my best counselor. She has been a strong pillar of support in all my endeavors."

The Byrds' marriage has brought them two wonderful daughters: Mona Byrd Fatemi and Marjorie Byrd Moore.

They have also been blessed with six grandchildren and three great-granddaughters.

After Mrs. Byrd and their family, the Senate and the Constitution, one of the things that Senator BYRD loves best—as we all know—is history—especially ancient history. So I think he may appreciate this thought from Homer:

There is nothing more admirable than two people who see eye-to-eye keeping house as man and wife, confounding their enemies, and delighting their friends.

For 66 years, ROBERT and Erma Byrd have done for more than delight their friends.

Together, they have created a full and rich life. They have raised a family. And they have served the people of West Virginia, and America, well. We wish them many more years of happiness together.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2003

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. On May 1, 2003, Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred on March 21, 2003. In Burbank, IL, an explosion caused by a powerful fireworks-type device damaged the 1989 Ford Econoline van of a Palestinian Muslim family and shook doors and windows of neighboring homes. The blast shattered the vehicle's windows and blew open the vehicle's door. The man who committed the crime is being held on bond and is

being charged with arson, criminal property damage, and committing a hate crime.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

NATIONAL HUNGER AWARENESS DAY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the only problem I have with National Hunger Awareness Day is that it should be every day. Across the Nation, 33 million of our fellow citizens are living in poverty and they deserve our help.

In recent weeks, Congress has been focused on giving hundreds of billions of dollars in new tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans, yet we leave the cupboard bare for millions of parents and low-income families. This week, as we debate the energy bill, we are listening carefully to the concerns of big corporations like Halliburton, Exxon, and Entergy, but not nearly carefully enough to the concerns of all those who need our help the most.

It is a national scandal and disgrace that for so many millions of Americans, hunger is an issue today and every day. Since the year 2000, poverty and unemployment have been on the rise, while wages and income continue to fall. Hardworking parents have been forced to make impossible choices between feeding their children and paying the rent and medical expenses. These are choices no parent should have to make.

No child should go hungry. But every night, 13 million children go to sleep not knowing where or when they will get their next meal. As hunger and malnutrition continue, children are more likely to be absent from school to have behavioral problems, and to have trouble learning to read or do math. They are less likely to be friends with other children or learn from their surroundings, and more likely to miss school because of illness.

Clearly, we have to move to end child hunger. This year, Congress will reauthorize the Child Nutrition Act. The Act includes important initiatives, such as school breakfasts and school lunches, and food programs for summer school, after school, and childcare.

Studies demonstrate that at-risk, school-age children depend on school-based breakfasts and lunches for more than half of their daily meals. In the reauthorization, we must work to see that every child eligible for subsidized programs actually receives these important meals. Schools must be reimbursed for the actual costs of providing nutritionally balanced meals. We also need these programs to provide additional resources, encourage nutrition

education, and to pay school employees a living wage.

We have a choice. Congress can continue to lavish more and more tax breaks on the wealthiest individuals and companies in the Nation, or we can invest in food for hungry children. The answer should be obvious to us all. We can and must ensure that no child is allowed to go hungry.

OKLAHOMA LOSS IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, over the past few months we've seen the fall of Saddam Hussein's brutal regime coupled with the dawning of a new day for the Iraqi people.

With major military combat operations in Iraq over and the security of our homeland bolstered, America and her allies are turning our efforts toward helping the Iraqi people build a free society.

Like many Americans, I was thrilled and heartened by the dramatic images of U.S. troops helping Iraqi citizens tear down statues and paintings of Saddam Hussein. The Iraqi people needed our help, our tanks, our troops, and our commitment to topple Saddam Hussein.

For the first time in their lives, many Iraqis are tasting freedom, and like people everywhere, they think it's wonderful. I'm proud of our military and America's commitment to make the people of the Middle East more free and secure.

Our military men and women surely face more difficult days in Iraq, and the Iraqi people will be tested by the responsibilities that come with freedom. The thugs who propped up the previous regime and outside forces with goals of their own will seek to cause problems, stir up trouble and initiate violence. Freedom is messy—nowhere more so than in a country that has just shaken off a brutal dictatorship.

But the journey towards a democratic Iraq has now been embarked upon. Like so many nations before it, Iraq now endures the growing pains common to a fledgling democracy. The uncertainty of today's Iraq, I am hopeful, will soon give way to the promise of a better future for the Iraqi people. And as we move closer to this goal, we must remember those who sacrificed for this noble cause.

Today, I rise to honor a man who made the ultimate sacrifice one can make for his country and the cause of freedom.

Specialist Jose A. Perez III was killed last week when his convoy was ambushed near Baghdad. Perez's convoy received fire from a rocket-propelled grenade while on a main supply route.

This San Diego, TX, native was stationed in Fort Sill. He came from a family with a proud military tradition who knows all too well the pain of losing a loved one. His uncle, Baldemar